UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,457	04/19/2004	Shinji Maekawa	0553-408	2984

7590 01/25/2008

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
SUITE 2850
200 WEST ADAMS STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
PADGETT, MARIANNE L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1792	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/827,457	MAEKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marianne L. Padgett	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/8/2008 & 11/5/2007 & 10/8/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,16-18 and 23-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,16-18 and 23-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/8/8*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/5/07 has been entered.

Applicants' amendments have clarified the claim language is so as to more clearly claim the affinity relationships between surface areas & liquid being deposited, however well the previous claims did not distinctly set forth this relationship, the relationships as clarified were considered in the rejections & are consistent with previous discussions repeated below.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 7, depended from claim 1, is directed to a surface having a liquid affinity (irradiated portions) for contact angles with the liquid of less than 10°, where liquid repellent portions are claimed to be all angles of 10° up to 180°, however since this is inclusive of angles which are considered to be associated with liquid affinity, such as hydrophilicity, as exemplified by definitions in Mitchell (4,487,905: col. 1, lines 60-68; hydrophilic = contact angle $\leq 80°$ & hydrophobic = contact angle greater than 80°); Bish et al. (4,421,809: col. 3, lines 51-55; hydrophilic = contact angle $\leq 70°$); Kato et al. (5,368,931: col. 5, lines 20-25; hydrophilic = contact angle with distilled water $\leq 50°$); Smith et al. (5,736,249: col. 3, lines 44-54; hydrophobic or semi hydrophobic $\equiv$ 85-99°), it is unclear how applicants specification enables a contact angle which is generally accepted to be associated with attraction or affinity, can cause repellents of what it is defined in the prior art to be attracted to, i.e. it is unclear how applicants specification enables an illiquid attractive surface to repel that liquid.

3. With respect independent claim 2 it as noted that the only place where the liquid composition is applied is in the group or hole that is independent film, hence it's only applied to the selected areas on the surface that need not have any of the thin film that has an affinity to the liquid. It is further note that since the plasma is forming a groove or hole in the surface of the thin film with the liquid affinity, that the only thing that can be clearly stated to be true about the surface of the groove or hole is that there has been removed thin film material having the claimed affinity in order to form that groove or hole surface, such that the resultant hole/groove surface may have completely removed thin film such that no affinity remains, the plasma may have modified the groove or hole surface so as to lack affinity or retained affinity; or the plasma may have only partially removed thin film with affinity, without affecting the affinity of the material. In other words, it is impossible to tell if there is any affinity or not in the holes/grooves, and since the only locations that necessarily have any affinity, are explicitly not deposited on, the presence of a film with affinity to the liquid not been deposited on that, it is essentially irrelevant to the deposition process, such that no clear benefit from the presence or absence of this film can be associated with the claimed process, which is merely filling a groove or hole within unknown liquid, having an unknown affinity to the surface of that groove or hole.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 & 29 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Seki et al.** (EP 0989778 A1, as discussed in the section 6 of the action mailed 11/7/2006, in view of **Lewis et al.** (5,272,979).

As previously discussed these claims require the plasma that effects the affinity to come from a nozzle, while Seki et al. (EP) only discusses the plasma and its effects, not the shape of the plasma or the

means of applying it, however it is **old and well-known as illustrated by Lewis et al.** (979) to employ plasma jet discharges in order to **ablate or otherwise transformed surface layers to change the affinity to subsequently applied coating**, such as printing ink or aqueous solutions, where such plasma techniques discussed in Lewis et al., include the use of working gases such as N, Ar or another inert gas or oxidizing gases, such as oxygen; can be employed for effecting positive or negative affinity of substrates, including for wet coating techniques. In Lewis et al. (979 see the abstract; figures 3 & 4; col. 3, lines 46-55; col. 4, especially lines 1-12, & 40-61; col. 5, lines 25-41; col. 6, lines 55-col. 7, line 29; col. 9, lines 51-61; col. 10, lines 25-39; col. 14, lines 43- 54+; and col. 15, lines 33-68+). It would've thought that to one of ordinary skill in the art that as Seki et al. is providing **teachings concerning plasmas that selectively affect the surface affinity to subsequent coating**, but do not discuss particular plasma details, to the two prior art plasma techniques, that create like differential affinity treatments, where the process of Lewis et al. provide such techniques which would have been expected to be equivalently effective in the process of Seki et al., as Lewis et al. demonstrates their techniques effectiveness for multiple different coatings inclusive of polymeric materials, metal materials, silicones, inks, etc., thus **showing** the expected general of **effectiveness of such affinity treatments via plasma from a nozzle**.

To reiterate, Seki et al. (EP) teach a deposition process that employs differential affinity of a liquid for treated substrate surfaces that may be **deposited via drops from an inkjet system**. In the first and fourth embodiments, is taught deposited a bank material to form partitions, where that bank material may be insulating material such as polyimide, or a 2 level bank with the upper-level been an organic layer such as polyimide & the lower layer being an inorganic insulator. The bank structure may be formed in an initial pattern deposition, or other conventional means such as depositing the insulating layer over the entire substrate, then patterning via etching with a mask to form the bank structure. In order to create adequate differentiation of affinity for the liquid to be deposited inside the enclosures surrounded by the

banks, Seki et al. (EP) teach plasma treatment, that may be consecutive treatments of oxygen plasma, then fluorine-containing plasma, or a single plasma with an optimized mixture of oxygen & fluorine containing gases, where the plasma may be an atmospheric pressure plasma, or a reduced pressure plasma (i.e. may be within the claimed pressure ranges). In either case selected differentiation of affinity occurs, that may create a liquid-repellent thin film on the insulating material of the banks, such that the contact angle is $\geq 50°$, while the oxygen in the plasma creates an affinity in the surrounded area, such that the contact angle is $\leq 20°$. Note that in either case of one plasma treatment or consecutive plasma treatments there is selective formation of an affinity region via plasma, where the affinity region is with the repellent thin film region on the surface of the substrate, and it is noted that with the mixed gas treatment the selective creation of affinity for the [polar] liquid to be deposited if simultaneous with the creation of the liquid-repellent thin film that essentially creates a Teflon surface on the banks. Liquid droplets to be deposited via inkjet printing inside the hydrophilic or affinity treated disclosures is inclusive of organic semiconductor material for forming thin film light emitting elements. Particularly see the abstract; figures 1-2, 8-9, etc.; [0002]; [0019-0024]; [0028]; [0030-31]; [0033]; [0037]; [0041- 46, especially 42 & 45]; [0048]; [0050-54]; [0059-62]; [0065-66]; first embodiment in [0072- 89, especially 77-79, 81, 84-85]; [0116]; fourth embodiment in [0122-131, especially 124, 125 & 129]; etc. also note that besides the specific example for use in forming EL elements & with polar liquids to be deposited, Seki et al. (EP) generally teach the use this technique for creating patterned liquid affinity & repellent regions, where the surface modification technique (e.g. plasma) is optimized according to polarity (polar or nonpolar) of the material to be deposited ([0022-24], [0030-31], [0037], [0041-42], 0045] +).

While specific pressures for dropped deposition were not noted, given the above discussed sequential plasma treatment followed by dropped deposition, it would've been obvious at one of ordinary skill in the art to employ similar pressures for the dropped deposition as were employed for the plasma pretreatment in order to avoid any need to change pressures significantly on a continuous manufacturing

line, especially considering that the pressure employed for the inkjet or dropped deposition processes would not be expected to significantly affect the process if pressures as taught for the plasma pretreatments were employed.

6. Claims 2, 5, 16-18 & 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki et al. (EP), in view of Lewis et al., as applied to claims 1, 3-4 & 6-7 above, and further in view of Di Dio (2004/0152329 A1).

As noted above, the claim of "an affinity for liquid" is to an unspecified liquid with no necessary to the location where deposition is occurring, where liquid could represent either a polar or a nonpolar liquid & has no necessary relationship to the surface of the groove or hole in which it is being deposited. Therefore, the thin film referred to in independent claim 2 could be a nonpolar or nonpolar, and as claimed need never have any actual effect on the deposition of the liquid composition to which it has affinity.

To reiterate discussion from section 7 of the action mailed 11/7/2006, while Seki et al. (EP) teach drop deposition of composition is having the opposite polarity from the banks/partition, **into the areas surrounded by the raised banks/partition**, and they teach that that partition may be **formed** by blanket deposition followed **by etching** (i.e. removes material analogous to forming holes or grooves), they do not teach that that etching is via plasma, but may use lithographic and masking techniques ([0079]; [0124]). Seki et al. also note in paragraph [0056], that it is also permissible to only do a fluorine-based plasma treatment.

Di Dio teach a process of depositing hydrophobic material, then depositing a "deep UV" photoresist material thereon, patterning the photoresist material to expose the hydrophobic layer in the pattern, followed by etching of the exposed hydrophobic material, where that etching may include plasma etching to expose underlying material. It would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the patterning technique of Di Dio in forming the banks and partitions in Seki et al. (EP), when

only fluorine-based plasma treatment of the material of the bank-forming layer is required, as it provides a lithographic and masking technique consistent with those suggested by the primary reference, and may combined steps or apply the patterning technique to the fluorine plasma treated bank-forming layer, after the plasma treatment for those situations as taught were oxygen-containing plasma treatment is not required to give sufficient hydrophobicity to the area where inkjet deposition is required to be performed, i.e. in the area surrounded by the banks. While this combination does not teach the plasma for the etching comes from a nozzle, Lewis et al. (979) as discussed above clearly teaches ablation from a plasma, where patterning is inclusive of their technique, hence the suggested plasma etching of the combination would have been further obvious to accomplish with a plasma from a nozzle, for reasons as discussed above & as it has been demonstrated to provide patterning as desired by the combination.

With respect to pressures employed, as discussed above it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ pressures most compatible with the most sensitive treatment techniques, which is generally a plasma, so as to minimize the need for differential prompting for sequential processing in an assembly line, where routine experimentation in order to optimize the process for efficiency would have been expected to be employed to determine suitable pressures.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 14-16 & 29-30 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. (6,228,435 B1), as discussed in the section 8 of the action mailed 11/7/2006, in view of Lewis et al. (5,272,979), discussed above in section 4.

Yoshikawa et al. teaches a parallel plate plasma apparatus, however as previously discussed desires to produce selective surface affinity effects, such that it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a plasma apparatus such as taught by Lewis et al. (979), which teaches the capability of direct writing type plasma treatment for affinity providing the advantageous capability of more precise patterning due to the selective nature of the direct write technique, thus motivating employed such an alternative with improved resolution or versatility in patterning is desired.

To reiterate, Yoshikawa et al. teach depositing a silane coupling agent via a plasma discharge process onto a base composed of a transparent glass sheet with a pattern of a thin metal film (light-shielding member) thereon, to deposit a water repellent thin film across the entire surface, including the insulating part of the surface. Thereafter, the coated substrate is treated to an oxygen plasma, which selectively exposes the dielectric substrate surface of the light transmitting material to make a less water repellent or hydrophilic pattern thereon, after which an inkjet system may be reproducibly employed to selectively deposit different colored inks in the hydrophilic section to make colored pixels. Particularly see the abstract; col. 4, lines 45-68; col. 5, lines 4-17 & 26-51; examples 1-2, particularly col. 6, lines 13-17, 20-26, 34-45 & 53-67; and claims, especially 1-2, 5, 9-11, 13-18 & 33.

Yoshikawa et al. (435) does not discuss particular degrees of hydrophilicity or water repellence, i.e. contact angles, however requires the differentiation to be sufficient to reproducibly effect the separation of the later inkjet deposited colored filter material, hence it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure the materials and treatment as taught produce adequate contact angle differentiation, which would have been expected to be inclusive of the claimed ranges in order to provide the taught reproducible results. Yoshikawa et al. (435) does not discuss the pressure under which the drop discharge from the inkjet system is operated, however such systems are typically operated at atmospheric pressure (i.e. not under vacuum), hence it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the taught inkjet processing under such typical conditions as atmospheric pressure. The plasma processing discussed in Yoshikawa et al. (435) discusses 0.1 torr or lower for the oxygen plasma and in the example 1 employs a pressure of 0.1 Pa for the oxygen plasma and a pressure of 0.05 Pa for plasma deposition of the silane coupling agent, hence does not use pressures in the particular range claimed for these specific exemplary materials in a specific RF plasma generator, however as indicated on col. 5, lines 23-25, the process is not limited to a specific plasma vapor deposition process, but any such known process may be employed, hence it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize

pressures for particular apparatus & deposition materials, such that any range of pressures affected for producing such deposition plasmas and oxygen plasmas would have been expected to be effective for the process, as the particular pressure employed is not critical, noting plasma apparatus that operate at atmospheric pressure & reduce pressure are old and well-known & the claimed range is inclusive of known plasma parameters employed with no specific materials and no specific apparatus.

8. References to Klein et al. (5134428) & Lewis et al. (WO 92/05957) provide equivalent teachings to those found in Lewis et al. (979).

9. Claim 1-7, 16-18 & 23-30 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,226,819 B2 (Maekawa et al.), in view of Lewis et al. (979). The patent claims are directed to processes with overlapping limitations, including for making like products with conductive layers and using plasma process to treat the surface to create particular liquid affinities, but differ by not requiring use of nozzles to apply the plasma, however as discussed above Lewis et al. (979) shows the general applicability & expected effectiveness of such techniques, such that it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that given selective affinity treatments to employ plasma techniques such as taught by Lewis et al. for the benefits in selectivity and precision derived therefrom.

10. Claims 1-6, 16-18 & 23-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-35, or claims 1-22, 28-37 & 44-47, or claims 1-12 & 23-27 of copending Application No. 10/575492, or 11/025192, or 11/749804 (≡ 2007/0218674 B1) respectively in view of a view of Lewis et al. (979). This application claims are directed to processes with overlapping limitations, including for making like products with conductive layers and treated to create selective regions of differentiated affinity to preceding liquid compositions to be dropped thereon, where (492) is using plasma process to treat the surface to create particular liquid affinities, but differ by not requiring use of nozzles to apply the plasma, , & application (192) is generic,

however as discussed above Lewis et al. (979) shows the general applicability & expected effectiveness of such techniques, such that it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that given selective affinity treatments to employ plasma techniques such as taught by Lewis et al. for the benefits in selectivity and precision derived therefrom. Note it with the equally applicable to the generic technique, as a means for creating the affinity would be required. Note newly applied application (804) also directed to conductive patterning techniques with plasma treatment to affect affinity or repellents may deposit its claim drops the inkjet methods, which methods are noted to employ nozzles.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

11. Previously cited art of interest included Kim et al. (7102722 B2) & Seki (6911773 B2), with further teachings involving selective affinity caused by plasma techniques with drop applied subsequent coatings, noting that Kim et al. uses masks to pattern the plasma, thus selectively applying it, but not via a nozzle; Seki et al. (6,784,459 B2; col. 6, lines 1-31); David et al. (6878419 B2); Kubacki (6,764,812 B1); & Okada et al. (2002/0014470 A1; [0133-136]), who provide further teachings inclusive of selective plasma treatment to affect the hydrophilicity, or liquid repelling nature of substrate surfaces. The application publication to Toyoda et al. (2006/0169672 A1) has relevant teachings, but is not prior art.

New art of interest to the state-of-the-art includes Chinn et al. (2007/0281492 A1), however this reference is not prior art. They Kimura et al. references cited in the 1/8/2008 IDS Borough I'd further teachings on employing surface affinities to deposition material to be patterned relevant & cumulative to the above rejections.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 16-18 & 23-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

That with respect to the claim of "grooves or holes", it is not necessary for a reference to use the same terminology to have configurations that can be considered equivalent. Applicant's generic

arguments which essentially state that they see no reason to combine the references, are not considered convincing for explaining why the reasons provided for the above obvious combinations by the examiner are would not have been obvious or expected to be effective.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne L. Padgett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1425. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from about 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks, can be reached at (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MLP/dictation software

1/21/2008

MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER